

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,441	10/695,441 10/29/2003		Perry N. Law	P67936US0 4583	
136	7590	08/18/2006		EXAMINER	
		MAN PLLC	NASSER, ROBERT L		
400 SEVEN SUITE 600		EEI N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHING	TON, DO	C 20004	3735		
				DATE MAILED: 08/18/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|--|

## **Advisory Action**

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/695,441	LAW ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Robert L. Nasser	3735	

Refore the Filing of an Annual Priof			,			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Robert L. Nasser	3735				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	lress			
	E REPLY FILED <u>27 July 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:</li> </ol>	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mi	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.  b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		E FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since			
AMENDMENTS	haa malaa ka ka daka af filisa a ba ba	will make a potation to	0001105			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further co</li> </ol>			ecause			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•	00.0.7,				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	• •	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a						
NOTE: the amendments to claim 19 raise new iss			(DTOL 204)			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTQL-324).			
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a</li> </ul>	•	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro		il be entered and an e	explanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 3,4,6,12,13 and 16.						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>5,7-11 and 17-19</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered by see attached.</li> </ol>	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	No(s)				
		Dohodi N				
		Robert L. Nasser Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3735				
		C.III. 0700				

Art Unit: 3735

Applicant's arguments filed 7/27/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has argued that there is no case law supporting the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 101 for claiming the human body. MPEP 2105 and OG Notice 1077 OG 24 (April 21, 1987) both establish that the human body cannot be claimed positively.

Applicant has also asserted that claim 19 is definite. The examiner disagrees. The claims recites that the number of emitters used (or wavelengths) is governed by the number of parameters being measured. There is no control means to vary the number of emitters. Therefore, it is unclear how many emitters are in the device, as applicant has not recited how many parameters are being measured. Essentially, applicant has not provided a definite recitation of what elements are in the claim.

The affidavit filed by David Bell has been considered, but has not been found to be persuasive. Mr. Bell argues that making Geddes' cuff black would inhibit light transmission therethrough and prevent measurements from being made. The examiner notes that Itonaga provides slits to allow the light to pass through and measurements to be made and makes the cuff black, to block extraneous light. Accordingly, it is the examiner's position that the combination does not destroy the intended operating function of Geddes.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert L. Nasser whose telephone number is 571 272-4731. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 9-5.

Art Unit: 3735

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Marmor II can be reached on 571 272-4730. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert L. Nasser Primary Examiner Art Unit 3735

RLN August 14, 2006

> ROBERT L. NASSER PRIMARY EXAMINER

Roll of Messy